



William J. Sutherland, Lynn V. Dicks, Nancy Ockendon, Silviu O. Petrovan and Rebecca K. Smith (dir.)

## What Works in Conservation 2018

Open Book Publishers

---

### 3.6 Threat: Transportation and service corridors

---

Publisher: Open Book Publishers  
Place of publication: Open Book Publishers  
Year of publication: 2018  
Published on OpenEdition Books: 21 March 2019  
Serie: OBP collection  
Electronic ISBN: 9791036524547



<http://books.openedition.org>

#### Electronic reference

3.6 Threat: Transportation and service corridors In: *What Works in Conservation 2018* [online]. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 2018 (generated 26 avril 2021). Available on the Internet: <<http://books.openedition.org/obp/6407>>. ISBN: 9791036524547.

---

## 3.6 Threat: Transportation and service corridors

---

### 3.6.1 Verges and airports

Based on the collated evidence, what is the current assessment of the effectiveness of interventions for verges and airports?	
Likely to be beneficial	• Scare or otherwise deter birds from airports
Unknown effectiveness (limited evidence)	• Mow roadside verges
No evidence found (no assessment)	• Sow roadside verges

#### Likely to be beneficial

##### ● Scare or otherwise deter birds from airports

Two replicated studies in the UK and USA found that fewer birds used areas of long grass at airports, but no data were provided on the effect of long grass on strike rates or bird mortality. *Assessment: likely to be beneficial (effectiveness 50%; certainty 44%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/261>

#### Unknown effectiveness (limited evidence)

##### ● Mow roadside verges

A single replicated, controlled trial in the USA found that mowed roadside verges were less attractive to ducks as nesting sites, but had higher nesting

success after four years. *Assessment: unknown effectiveness — limited evidence (effectiveness 30%; certainty 30%; harms 9%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/259>

## No evidence found (no assessment)

We have captured no evidence for the following intervention:

- Sow roadside verges

## 3.6.2 Power lines and electricity pylons

Based on the collated evidence, what is the current assessment of the effectiveness of interventions for power lines and electricity pylons?	
<b>Beneficial</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark power lines</li> </ul>
<b>Likely to be beneficial</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bury or isolate power lines</li> <li>• Insulate electricity pylons</li> <li>• Remove earth wires from power lines</li> <li>• Use perch-deterrents to stop raptors perching on pylons</li> </ul>
<b>Unknown effectiveness (limited evidence)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thicken earth wires</li> </ul>
<b>Unlikely to be beneficial</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add perches to electricity pylons</li> <li>• Reduce electrocutions by using plastic, not metal, leg rings to mark birds</li> <li>• Use raptor models to deter birds from power lines</li> </ul>

## Beneficial

### ● Mark power lines

A total of eight studies and two literature reviews from across the world found that marking power lines led to significant reductions in bird collision mortalities. Different markers had different impacts. *Assessment: beneficial (effectiveness 81%; certainty 85%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/265>



## Likely to be beneficial

### ● Bury or isolate power lines

A single before-and-after study in Spain found a dramatic increase in juvenile eagle survival following the burial or isolation of dangerous power lines. *Assessment: likely to be beneficial (effectiveness 60%; certainty 44%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/262>

### ● Insulate electricity pylons

A single before-and-after study in the USA found that insulating power pylons significantly reduced the number of Harris's hawks electrocuted. *Assessment: likely to be beneficial (effectiveness 60%; certainty 45%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/268>

### ● Remove earth wires from power lines

Two before-and-after studies from Norway and the USA describe significant reductions in bird collision mortalities after earth wires were removed from sections of power lines. *Assessment: likely to be beneficial (effectiveness 90%; certainty 60%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/263>

### ● Use perch-deterrents to stop raptors perching on pylons

A single controlled study in the USA found that significantly fewer raptors were found near perch-deterrent lines, compared to controls, but no information on electrocutions was provided. *Assessment: likely to be beneficial (effectiveness 50%; certainty 45%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/269>

## Unknown effectiveness (limited evidence)

### ● Thicken earth wires

A single paired sites trial in the USA found no reduction in crane species collision rates in a wire span with an earth wire three times thicker than

normal. *Assessment: unknown effectiveness — limited evidence (effectiveness 0%; certainty 25%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/264>

## Unlikely to be beneficial

### ● Add perches to electricity pylons

A single before-and-after study in Spain found that adding perches to electricity pylons did not reduce electrocutions of Spanish imperial eagles. *Assessment: unlikely to be beneficial (effectiveness 0%; certainty 42%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/267>

### ● Reduce electrocutions by using plastic, not metal, leg rings to mark birds

A single replicated and controlled study in the USA found no evidence that using plastic leg rings resulted in fewer raptors being electrocuted. *Assessment: unlikely to be beneficial (effectiveness 0%; certainty 42%; harms 0%).*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/270>

### ● Use raptor models to deter birds from power lines

A single paired sites trial in Spain found that installing raptor models near power lines had no impact on bird collision mortalities. *Assessment: unlikely to be beneficial (effectiveness 0%; certainty 43%; harms 0%)*

<http://www.conservationevidence.com/actions/266>